MOVERS & SHAKERS

Women of the U.S. House and Senate

Senators Margaret Chase Smith & Elizabeth Ann Warren

Declaration of Conscience (1950)

by Margaret Chase Smith

U.S. Senator Margaret Chase Smith made her Declaration of Conscience speech on June 1, 1950, shortly after having been removed from the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations at the height of the McCarthy Era. In it, she criticised national leadership and called for the United States, the Senate, and the Republican Party to re-examine the tactics used by the HUAC and Senator Joseph McCarthy. The speech is widely regarded as one of the turning points against the McCarthy anti-communism campaign.

Mr. President:

I would like to speak briefly and simply about a serious national condition. It is a national feeling of fear and frustration that could result in national suicide and the end of everything that we Americans hold dear. It is a condition that comes from the lack of effective leadership in either the Legislative Branch or the Executive Branch of our Government.

That leadership is so lacking that serious and responsible proposals are being made that national advisory commissions be appointed to provide such critically needed leadership.

I speak as briefly as possible because too much harm has already been done with irresponsible words of bitterness and selfish political opportunism. I speak as simply as possible because the issue is too great to be obscured by eloquence. I speak simply and briefly in the hope that my words will be taken to heart.

I speak as a Republican, I speak as a woman. I speak as a United States Senator. I speak as an American.

The United States Senate has long enjoyed worldwide respect as the greatest deliberative body in the world. But recently that deliberative character has too often been debased to the level of a forum of hate and character assassination sheltered by the shield of congressional immunity.

It is ironical that we Senators can in debate in the Senate directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to any American, who is not a Senator, any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming an American -- and without that non-Senator

American having any legal redress against us -- yet if we say the same thing in the Senate about our colleagues we can be stopped on the grounds of being out of order.

It is strange that we can verbally attack anyone else without restraint and with full protection and yet we hold ourselves above the same type of criticism here on the Senate Floor. Surely the United States Senate is big enough to take self-criticism and self-appraisal. Surely we should be able to take the same kind of character attacks that we dish out to outsiders.

I think that it is high time for the United States Senate and its members to do some soul searching -- for us to weigh our consciences -- on the manner in which we are performing our duty to the people of America -- on the manner in which we are using or abusing our individual powers and privileges.

I think that it is high time that we remembered that we have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution. I think that it is high time that we remembered; that the Constitution, as amended, speaks not only of the freedom of speech but also of trial by jury instead of trial by accusation.

Whether it be a criminal prosecution in court or a character prosecution in the Senate, there is little practical distinction when the life of a person has been ruined.

Those of us who shout the loudest about Americanism in making character assassinations are all too frequently those who, by our own words and acts, ignore some of the basic principles of Americanism --

The right to criticize;
The right to hold unpopular beliefs;
The right to protest;
The right of independent thought.

The exercise of these rights should not cost one single American citizen his reputation or his right to a livelihood nor should he be in danger of losing his reputation or livelihood merely because he happens to know some one who holds unpopular beliefs. Who of us doesn't? Otherwise none of us could call our souls our own. Otherwise thought control would have set in.

The American people are sick and tired of being afraid to speak their minds lest they be politically smeared as "Communists" or "Fascists" by their opponents. Freedom of speech is not what it used to be in America. It has been so abused by some that it is not exercised by others. The American people are sick and tired of seeing innocent people smeared and guilty people whitewashed. But there have been enough proved cases to cause nationwide distrust and strong suspicion that there may be something to the unproved, sensational accusations.

As a Republican, I say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that the Republican Party faces a challenge today that is not unlike the challenge that it faced back in Lincoln's day. The Republican Party so successfully met that challenge that it emerged from the Civil War as the champion of a united nation -- in addition to being a Party that unrelentingly fought loose spending and loose programs.

Today our country is being psychologically divided by the confusion and the suspicions that are bred in the United States Senate to spread like cancerous tentacles of "know nothing, suspect everything" attitudes. Today we have a Democratic Administration that has developed a mania for loose spending and loose programs. History is repeating itself -- and the Republican Party again has the opportunity to emerge as the champion of unity and prudence.

The record of the present Democratic Administration has provided us with sufficient campaign issues without the necessity of resorting to political smears. America is rapidly losing its position as leader of the world simply because the Democratic Administration has pitifully failed to provide effective leadership.

The Democratic Administration has completely confused the American people by its daily contradictory grave warnings and optimistic assurances -- that show the people that our Democratic Administration has no idea of where it is going.

The Democratic Administration has greatly lost the confidence of the American people by its complacency to the threat of communism here at home and the leak of vital secrets to Russia through key officials of the Democratic Administration. There are enough proved cases to make this point without diluting our criticism with unproved charges.

Surely these are sufficient reasons to make it clear to the American people that it is time for a change and that a Republican victory is necessary to the security of this

country. Surely it is clear that this nation will continue to suffer as long as it is governed by the present ineffective Democratic Administration.

Yet to displace it with a Republican regime embracing a philosophy that lacks political integrity or intellectual honesty would prove equally disastrous to this nation. The nation sorely needs a Republican victory. But I don't want to see the Republican Party ride to political victory on the Four Horsemen of Calumny -- Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry and Smear.

I doubt if the Republican Party could -- simply because I don't believe the American people will uphold any political party that puts political exploitation above national interest. Surely we Republicans aren't that desperate for victory.

I don't want to see the Republican Party win that way. While it might be a fleeting victory for the Republican Party, it would be a more lasting defeat for the American people. Surely it would ultimately be suicide for the Republican Party and the two-party system that has protected our American liberties from the dictatorship of a one party system.

As members of the Minority Party, we do not have the primary authority to formulate the policy of our Government. But we do have the responsibility of rendering constructive criticism, of clarifying issues, of allaying fears by acting as responsible citizens.

As a woman, I wonder how the mothers, wives, sisters and daughters feel about the way in which members of their families have been politically mangled in Senate debate -- and I use the word 'debate' advisedly.

As a United States Senator, I am not proud of the way in which the Senate has been made a publicity platform for irresponsible sensationalism. I am not proud of the reckless abandon in which unproved charges have been hurled from this side of the aisle. I am not proud of the obviously staged, undignified countercharges that have been attempted in retaliation from the other side of the aisle.

I don't like the way the Senate has been made a rendezvous for vilification, for selfish political gain at the sacrifice of individual reputations and national unity. I am not proud of the way we smear outsiders from the Floor of the Senate and hide behind the cloak of congressional immunity and still place ourselves beyond criticism on the Floor of the Senate.

As an American, I am shocked at the way Republicans and Democrats alike are playing directly into the Communist design of "confuse, divide and conquer." As an American, I don't want a Democratic Administration "white wash" or "cover up" any more than I want a Republican smear or witch hunt.

As an American, I condemn a Republican "Fascist" just as much as I condemn a Democrat "Communist." I condemn a Democrat "fascist" just as much as I condemn a Republican "Communist." They are equally dangerous to you and me and to our country. As an American, I want to see our nation recapture the strength and unity it once had when we fought the enemy instead of ourselves.

It is with these thoughts I have drafted what I call a "Declaration of Conscience." I am gratified that Senator Tobey, Senator Aiken, Senator Morse, Senator Ives, Senator Thye and Senator Hendrickson, have concurred in that declaration and have authorized me to announce their concurrence.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Speech Opposing William Barr's Nomination for Attorney General (2019)

by Elizabeth Ann Warren
Senator for Massachusetts

Delivered on the floor of the United States Senate on 12 February 2019

I join my colleagues on the Senate floor to discuss William Barr, President Trump's nominee to serve as America's next attorney general. The Attorney General's job is to defend the U.S. Constitution against all enemies, foreign or domestic. To stand up for the rights of all Americans.

But President Trump has a different view of an Attorney General's role. He has made it quite clear that he's not interested in an Attorney General who is committed to working for the American people. For President Trump, only two criteria matter when it comes to picking an Attorney General. Number one: loyalty to President Trump.

William Barr easily checks that box. Just look at the Mueller investigation. As Special Counsel Mueller's team investigates whether there are connections between Russia's meddling in U.S. elections and the Trump campaign and indicts more and more people with close ties to the President, President Trump has viciously attacked the investigation, calling it a witch hunt.

Trump was not pleased that his first pick for Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, recused himself from the Mueller investigation. He doesn't want to make the same mistake twice. In Barr, the President has found someone he believes will put the President's interests above those of the country. It's not hard to see why. Barr has taken extraordinary steps to undermine the Mueller investigation, even voluntarily submitting an unsolicited memo to the Justice Department arguing that the Special Counsel doesn't have the power to investigate Trump for obstruction of justice. That's quite the cover letter for a job application when the job is overseeing the very investigation you don't think should exist in the first place.

Loyalty to President Trump. Check.

The second criterion for President Trump when picking an Attorney General--or any nominee to serve in the highest levels of the federal government--is whether the nominee will continue to tilt our government further in favor of the powerful few over everyone else.

Once again, Barr checks the box. Barr's record on women's rights, criminal justice reform, immigration, and so many more issues shows that he will promote the interests of the powerful few instead of defending the rights of all.

Take women's rights.

Barr believes that Roe v. Wade--the Supreme Court case establishing the right to abortion care--was wrongly decided and should be overturned. He also joined an amicus brief arguing that employers should be allowed to deny women access to contraceptive care based on the employers' religious beliefs.

On criminal justice reform, Barr has endorsed harmful policies that have perpetuated America's broken criminal justice system. While serving as Attorney General in the early 1990s, the Justice Department issued a report arguing that the U.S. had an under-incarceration problem--that we put too few people in jail in this country--and Barr has personally made many statements in line with that

misguided approach. He's argued that children should be prosecuted as adults. And despite the fact that Black people are arrested, prosecuted, convicted, and more harshly sentenced than their white counterparts, Barr has denied that racial disparities exist in the criminal justice system and has championed discriminatory sentencing policies.

On immigration, Barr supported the first--and harshest--iteration of President Trump's unconstitutional and immoral Muslim ban. In his stint as Attorney General in the 90s, he advocated for denying political asylum to Haitian asylum seekers who happened to be HIV-positive.

On health care, Barr has argued that the Affordable Care Act is unconstitutional. On LGBTQ equality, he's opposed efforts to promote LGBTQ equality. The list goes on and on.

There's no doubt that, if confirmed, Barr would continue the same broken system that protects the wealthy and well-connected but leaves everyone else behind.

The President doesn't hide what he wants from an Attorney General. Someone who will put protecting the President ahead of protecting our constitution. And someone who will help maintain America's two very different justice systems--one that protects and coddles the wealthy and the powerful, and another harsh, unjust system for everyone else.

Barr's record shows that he is not the Attorney General that America desperately needs--an Attorney General who will stand up for the rule of law and for the rights of all Americans. That is why I will vote no on Barr's nomination, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

In Recognition of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day
by Nancy Pelosi

Congressional Record: January 13, 1995 (Extensions of Remarks) Page E91.
DOCID:cr13ja95-6.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DAY

_____

HON. NANCY PELOSI
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 13, 1995

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. with two shining examples of his legacy in San Francisco. One represents the closing of an era; the other, the limitless possibilities with its opening.

This month, San Francisco will bid a fond farewell to Lulann Sapp McGriff, who is retiring after more than two decades of service to the NAACP in the bay area. Lulann has been a tireless champion of freedom and opportunity for African-Americans and other people of color in San Francisco and the entire Western United States for nearly two decades. She has held these positions within the NAACP during that time: Assistant western regional director; NAACP California State conference sectional coordinator; State educational chair; and an unprecedented four terms as San Francisco NAACP branch president.

A social worker and educator, Lulann works in the City College of San Francisco as a counselor, and through her efforts has established African-American male and female retention programs for high school students in the San Francisco Unified School District. She has been a powerful force in enforcing the court orders which desegregated public schools on the west coast. She has been, and will continue to be, a shining model of civic and community service to our Nation.

But while Lulann's tenure as San Francisco NAACP president comes to a close, San Francisco witnesses the dawning of another era with the opening of the Thurgood Marshall Academic High School. Mr. Speaker, I was given the privilege

of participating at the dedication of the school, where we were graced by the presence of Justice Marshall's family, including his widow, Cecilia. This school, located in the Bayview-Hunters Point district of San Francisco, offers a rigorous and innovative academic program targeted at low-income, minority students.

The San Francisco Chronicle wrote, "there is a sense of enthusiasm and optimism among the students, many from poor neighborhoods who feel they are pioneers in a bold and interesting educational adventure." This school, by stressing educational enrichment for all students, does honor to the legacy of Thurgood Marshall.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will join in celebrations throughout the country to honor the life and work of the great Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. We best honor his legacy, however, through deeds which seek to advance and uplift the human spirit and create opportunity for all Americans, regardless of race, color or creed. Lulann McGriff and the Thurgood Marshall Academic High School, through their work on behalf of the education and advancement of young people, are living testaments to Dr. King's memory.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Speech about an immigrant constituent (2019)

by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez

Congressional Record Volume 165, issue 9, pages H668–H669.

Thank you. Thank you Madam Speaker.

Today, I rise to tell the story of one of my constituents: Yahi Obed. Mr. Obed was born in Yemen and came to the United States with he was eight years old. His childhood dream was to become a pilot and he knew and felt that in the United States, all things are possible and his dream could come true. Mr. Obed's dream did come true. He's been a federal employee for 14 years, has two children, and a mortgage for his home in the Morris Parks neighborhood of the Bronx. He studied

hard, got his pilot's license, and is now an air traffic controller supervisor at John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York City.

I spoke with Mr. Obed today over the phone. He and air traffic controllers like him across the country missed their first paycheck this past week. He was telling me about how stressful his job is. Every single day, air traffic controllers have thousands of people's lives in their hands, with weather changes, flight delays, staffing complexities, and a myriad of other issues, their days almost never go exactly to plan. His job is to find solutions, analyze and adapt in real time to keep people safe in one of the busiest air spaces in the United States and the world. And it is terrifying to think that almost every single air traffic controller in the United States is currently distracted at work because they don't know when their next paycheck is coming.

Federal workers' jobs are stressful enough. The rise in New York City's cost of living is stressful enough. The fact that Mr. Obed's family cannot be reunified due to fears over the Muslim ban is stressful enough. His several-thousand-dollar-a-month Bronx mortgage is stressful enough. The anti-immigrant sentiment of this administration is stressful enough. And the truth of this shutdown is that it's actually not about a wall, it is not about the border, and it is certainly not about the well-being of everyday Americans. The truth is, this shut down is about the erosion of American democracy and the subversion of our most basic governmental norms. It is not normal to hold 800,000 workers' paychecks hostage. It is not normal to shut down the government we we don't get what we want. It is not normal for public servants to run away and hide from the public that they serve. And it is certainly not normal to starve the people we serve for a proposal that is wildly unpopular among the American people. Each and every member of this body has a responsibility to this nation and to everyone in the United States of America, whether they voted for us or not. And this president shares in that responsibility as well, which means that he has a responsibility to my constituent Mr. Obed. President Trump has a responsibility to all air traffic controllers, FDA inspectors, TSA workers, and he has a responsibility to maintain the basic functioning of the United States government.

Thank you very much. Madam Speaker, I yield my time.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Remarks Onboard the USS North Carolina (2004)

by Elizabeth Dole

Delivered on 25 May 2004.

Thank you so much for that wonderful, warm welcome. And thank you, Mr. Bryan, for those very kind words of introduction. It is a privilege to be with you and other Battleship Commissioners. I must say, I am certainly earning my sea legs this week! This past Saturday I was honored to be in Newport News, Virginia as the keynote speaker for the Keel Laying Ceremony for the nation's newest submarine, the USS North Carolina. But today – well, this is a real first for me. Over the years I have been so fortunate to speak all over America – the world, even. But to be invited to speak on a Battleship – the USS North Carolina, no less - is truly an experience unlike any other. I am so pleased to be here.

As my staff and I were getting prepared for our events this week, I was informed of a sea-worthy tidbit. It seems that during World War II, Admiral Chester William Nimitz explained that "A ship is always referred to as 'she' because it costs so much to keep one in paint and powder." I have a hard time believing Admiral Nimitz was telling the truth!

Military service has always been a part of my family – as some of you may know, my husband Bob is a Veteran. But what you may not know is that my brother John Hanford served in the Navy. In World War II, John was in the Pacific Theater on the aircraft carrier Saratoga. She was seriously damaged a number of times by Japanese suicide planes, and I can remember my big brother John coming home on "survivor's leave."

This great vessel I stand on today played a significant role in defending our country, just as my husband Bob, my brother John and so many of you did when called to duty.

And we all know there are as many different definitions of 'veteran' as there are veterans themselves. There are veterans of war and veterans of peace. Combat veterans and non-combat veterans. Veterans who served on the seas, in the air, or on the ground. Veterans from the Cold War and veterans from the hot wars: the

World Wars; Korea; Vietnam; Panama; Grenada and the Persian Gulf. And now veterans of Afghanistan and Iraq. Still, all are veterans.

And every Veteran has a story. I am certain that in this audience today there are real life stories of heroism, of sacrifice. There are somber stories of tragedy in war. And there are inspiring stories of courage and enduring hope for peace.

I am so proud to represent the hundreds of thousands of Veterans who call North Carolina home. It is a privilege indeed to serve those who have so valiantly served their country. When I was running for the Senate, I promised to work for our veterans – and that is a promise I am keeping. When I arrived on Capitol Hill, I immediately sought a seat on the Armed Services Committee. I want to be a voice for North Carolina in the decisions relating to our country's military – past and present.

I support President Bush's budget request for 5.6 billion dollars in new spending for the Department of Veterans Affairs, for benefits, for services. President Bush has the right man on the job for veterans – Secretary Tony Principi. Tony and I have been friends for a long time. I know if we give him the resources, he will do the very best for every American who has served this country.

America owes so much to our veterans, especially when it comes to their health care needs. Waiting times to visit with a doctor are far too long. It's often difficult to see specialists. Veterans in rural areas have to travel too far to get care at all. Especially as the average age of our nation's veterans is rising, we must ensure quality health care for all veterans.

The good news is thanks to the President's leadership, things are changing for the better. Since the year 2001, the President has increased VA health care funding by more than 30 percent. This year alone, VA will care for 1.4 million more veterans than in the year 2000, and 194 new community-based clinics have opened to be more responsive to veterans' needs.

I continue to express my support for concurrent receipt. This nation promised our servicemen and women that they would be cared for if they became disabled while serving. We also promised them a pension if they served long enough in our armed forces. Our veterans who are both disabled and long-serving should receive both benefits. North Carolina's disabled veterans have earned both.

The legislation enacted in the Fiscal Year 2003 National Defense Authorization Act was a beginning, restoring benefits to retirees with disabilities who were awarded the Purple Heart or who were severely disabled by combat-related activities, was a beginning. One significant achievement in the Fiscal Year 2004 National Defense Authorization Act was the further expansion of those benefits for a larger group of disabled military retirees. Special compensation will now be extended to all military retirees whose disabling condition was due to combat or combat-related operations. Additionally, concurrent receipt will be phased in over the next ten years for those retirees with non-combat related disabilities of fifty percent or greater. Admittedly, the fight is not over. We will work to find a solution that meets the goal of full concurrent receipt for all military retired eligible for disability benefits. We must fight for these veterans just as they have fought for us and our freedoms!

We must also continue to support those who are fighting for our freedoms now. We have the best equipped, most capable, most courageous military force in the world. They are fighting a daily battle in a war we all know requires steadfast commitment, both in the theater of battle and here at home.

I'm reminded of a letter I read recently from Marine Major General J.N. Mattis. His words were intended for the men and women of the First Marine Division, deployed to give reprieve to the 82nd Airborne Division currently serving in the Middle East. They were as encouraging as they were poignant. "You are going to write history, my fine young Sailors and Marines," he said, "so write it well."

And indeed, ladies and gentlemen, they are writing it well – in fact – they are writing pages of history with tales of heroism, courage, and compassion. I am in awe of the sacrifices made each and every day by our men and women in uniform in every branch of the military fighting the War on Terror.

Shortly after the attacks of September 11th Fred Cranford of Drexel, North Carolina talked about losing his 32-year-old son, Lieutenant Commander Eric Cranford, at the Pentagon. In the midst of a grief most of us cannot even imagine, Fred Cranford said, "Even out of evil, God can bring good things." How right he was! While those terrorists intended their evil to divide this country – they have failed.

In fact, they have tried this tactic numerous times, and failed again and again. When terrorists attacked Bali, thinking it would weaken Indonesia's resolve – they

failed. They attacked synagogues and a British Cultural Center in Istanbul, Turkey hoping to divide that country - they failed. Today terrorists continue their cowardly attacks aimed at innocent Iraqis, humanitarian aid workers, and families of all nationalities. Their latest attempts to divide and conquer are failing. Now the United States must continue the mission - and ensure they continue to fail.

Our mission in the War on Terror has led to the liberation of 50 million people. We have captured or killed 46 of the 55 most wanted in Iraq, including Saddam Hussein. The Iraqi Governing Council signed the Transitional Administrative Law. This unprecedented framework promises long overdue civil rights for all Iraqis. It ensures freedom of religion, freedom of expression, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly – and fundamental rights for women. Coalition forces have also rehabilitated 2,500 schools, renovated 240 hospitals, opened 1,200 health clinics, immunized 5 million children and helped initiate the publishing of 170 newspapers.

Because of our incredible armed forces we are moving forward in the War on Terror, and celebrating freedom with countries that feared they would never know the meaning of the word.

We are asking a lot of our servicemen and women right now. But this is not the first time we have called on good people to protect our country. Many of you here today are a testimony to that.

I am committed to building a strong and modern military. Thousands of young men and women from North Carolina have been called into harm's way. With all of our state's major military installations that include representatives of all the military services, our National Guard Brigade, and our Reserves fighting the Global War on Terror, North Carolina has taken a preeminent role in defending this great nation.

We must continue to give our armed forces, intelligence agencies and law enforcement the resources they need to keep America safe.

This past month my colleagues and I have been working intensely on the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2005. This bill means great things for North Carolina military members. It authorizes more than $339 million for military construction and $58 million for family housing programs, and it provides for $27 million to fund improvements to facilities supporting North Carolina

National Guard and Reserve forces. The bill also mandates a 3.5% pay raise as well as increased benefits for our men and women in uniform who have more than proven they deserve it!

But, what our troops need now more than anything is the steadfast support of a unified nation, a country proudly recognizing the mission of our soldiers and setting aside partisan politics. I was moved this week by words from the front lines, written by a Marine named Ben Connable, on his third deployment to the Middle East. Major Connable said, "I am not ignorant of the political issues; but as a professional, I have the luxury of putting politics aside and focusing on the task at hand. Protecting people from terrorists and criminals while building schools and lasting friendships is a good mission, no matter what brush it's tarred with. Nothing any talking head will say can deter me or my fellow Marines from caring about the people of Iraq, or take away from the sacrifices of our comrades. Fear in the face of adversity is human nature, and many people who take the counsel of their fears speak today. We are not deaf to their cries; neither do we take heed. All we ask is that Americans stand by us by supporting not just the troops, but also the mission. We'll take care of the rest." Ladies and Gentlemen, the commitment our troops have to the mission at hand is built on the efforts of those who have gone before them, Veterans, heroes – like so many of you here today…As I look out at this audience this morning, I know many of you proudly served in World War II.

I am looking forward to celebrating the official opening of the World War II memorial in Washington later this week. I remember the crisp Veteran's Day in the year 2000 when I was honored to be with 15,000 World War II veterans, their families and friends on the National Mall for the groundbreaking ceremony. Ten times as many veterans, family and friends will gather on the Mall when America honors these heroes by dedicating this national tribute to the sacrifice and achievement of the World War II generation.

I think specifically about the sacrifices made by my own husband. Bob returned from World War II years before I met him. Yet I know the story of his injury well. Bob fought on the front lines in World War II as part of the 10th Mountain Division in Italy. As he led his men to destroy a machine gun nest hidden in a farmhouse, a shell fragment shattered his shoulder and damaged his vertebrae. He was paralyzed. He spent 39 months in various hospitals, and doctors operated on him eight times.

To this day, my husband lives with those injuries, and endures them. He still

remembers those left on the battleground, too. His life is not unlike the story of many veterans, I imagine.

Let me share with you a very poignant moment when Bob and I were dating, and he was visiting my parents in Salisbury. Bob appeared one morning in the kitchen as Mother was preparing breakfast, with a towel draped over his right shoulder. "Mrs. Hanford," he told my mother, "I think you ought to see my problem."

"That's not a problem, Bob," she told him. "That's a badge of honor."

And so it is with our Armed Forces…those returning home… those who've gone on… those who came back with a disability, as Bob did. They carry badges of honor for all that they've given this country.

We live in freedom because of those badges of honor. We live in freedom because of those sacrifices – your sacrifices.

As we near Memorial Day we honor each and every American's commitment to our nation. The contributions made to the security of our country – indeed, the security of our world – contributions worthy of great praise. We recognize the dedication of all who have ever worn the uniform of the United States, the sacrifices of the thousands who never came home, their families, and the men and women who are fighting as we speak. On behalf of all of America - thank you for your service to this country.

May God bless you all and may God continue to bless this great land of the free, America.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Honoring God and Country

by Ginny Brown-Waite

Congressional Record. June 26, 2008. Extensions of Remarks. Page E1372.
DOCID:cr26jn08-56.

HON. GINNY BROWN-WAITE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 26, 2008

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, for over 225 years the United States has been a beacon of hope and freedom throughout the world. Millions of people from every corner of the world have left their homelands to come to America and start a new life, one based on the rights and liberties enshrined in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

That freedom comes at a price, however. Whether it is the original fight for independence during the American Revolution, the drive to defeat communism during the cold war, or the current battle against global Islamic extremists, soldiers throughout our history have fought and given their lives to keep us safe here at home. I salute their sacrifice and dedication to their fellow man, and thank those veterans here today for your great military service.

While our Nation has often had to defend itself from enemies, both foreign and domestic, it has been our shared commitment to faith and belief in a higher power that has given us the strength to soldier on during tough and trying times. America has seen both the good and the bad throughout our Nation's history, but in the end I firmly believe that each of us will heed the call to the better angels of our nature when forced to make decisions that affect our fellow man.

Together we can continue the great success of the United States. Throughout our history, while our ancestors came from all over the globe, the great melting pot that is America meant that we have shared a common language and a common faith. Our Nation is firmly rooted in Christian principles that have made us strong and envied by the rest of the world. Whenever a crisis happens in a faraway land across the seas, it is men and women like you who pull together in the spirit of

Christian charity and a desire to help your fellow man. It is our military that brings relief supplies to nations like Burma or Indonesia after their floods, and the United States Armed Forces that meets the challenge of liberating Europe from the Axis superpowers. The can-do spirit of our Nation means we never back away from a challenge, and that by working together we can accomplish anything we set our minds to.

America is the greatest nation in the world. We have a proud history of service, faith and community ties that bind us to the common belief in the goodness of mankind. By working together we can continue that history and ensure that future generations of Americans will share the ideals and values that brought us here today. Thank you and God bless the United States of America.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Maiden Speech on Defending Immigrant Communities (2017)

by Kamala Harris

Delivered on the floor of the United States Senate on 16 February 2017

Mr. President,

I rise today humbled to offer my first official speech as the junior United States Senator from the great State of California. I rise with a deep sense of reverence for this institution, for its history, and for its unique role as a defender of our nation's ideals. Above all, I rise today with a sense of gratitude for all those upon whose shoulders we stand. For me, it starts with my mother Shyamala Harris.

She arrived at the University of California, Berkeley from India in 1959 with dreams of becoming a scientist. The plan, when she finished school was to go back home to a traditional Indian marriage. But when she met my father Donald Harris, she made a different plan. She went against a practice reaching back thousands of years, and instead of an arranged marriage, chose a love marriage. This act of self-

determination made my sister Maya and myself. And it made us Americans, like millions of children of immigrants before and since. And I know she's looking down on us today. And knowing my mother, she's probably saying, "Kamala, what on earth is going on down there? We have got to stand up for our values!"

So in the spirit of my mother, who was always direct, I cannot mince words. In the early weeks of this administration, we have seen an unprecedented series of executive actions that have hit our immigrant and religious communities like a cold front, striking a chilling fear in the hearts of millions of good hardworking people. All by executive fiat.

By fiat, we have seen the President stick taxpayers with a bill for a multi-billion dollar border wall without regard for the role of the United States Congress under Article 1 of the Constitution.

By fiat, we've seen a President mandate the detention of immigrants, both documented and undocumented, creating a dragnet that could ensnare 8 million people.

By fiat, the President has ordered the creation of what essentially will be a 15,000-member deportation force.

By fiat, he wants to take away state and local authority, by making local police officers act as federal immigration officials.

By fiat, the President wants to slam the gates of freedom by instituting a Muslim ban - a ban which was carelessly written as it has been incompetently enforced.

And in recent days, we have seen an increased severity in immigration raids sweeping across this country, including the arrest of a DREAMer in Seattle and a domestic violence victim in Texas.

And we have seen an administration violate court orders, attack the first amendment, bully federal judges, and mock Americans exercising their right to freely assemble.

Mr. President, I rise today to discuss how these actions impact my State of California and our country. And in particular, the State of California I believe is a microcosm of who we are as America. In California we have farmers and

environmentalists, welders and technologists, Republicans, Democrats, Independents, and the largest number of immigrants - documented and undocumented - of any state in the nation.

I rise because the President's actions have created deep uncertainty and pain for our refugee and immigrant communities.

I rise on behalf of California's more than 250,000 "Dreamers" who were told by the federal government -- if you sign up, we will not use your personal information against you.

I rise to say, the United States of America cannot go back on our promise to these kids and their families.

And I rise today as a lifelong prosecutor and as the former top cop of the biggest state in this country to say these executive actions present a real threat to our public safety.

Let me repeat that. The President's immigration actions and Muslim ban will make America less safe.

As a prosecutor, I can tell you, it is a serious mistake to conflate criminal justice policy with immigration policy as if they are the same thing. They are not. I have personally prosecuted everything from low-level offenses to homicides. I know what a crime looks like. I will tell you: an undocumented immigrant is not a criminal. But that's what these actions do. They suggest all immigrants are criminals and treat immigrants like criminals. And there's no question, those who commit crimes must face severe and serious and swift consequence and accountability. But the truth is the vast majority of immigrants are hardworking people who deserve a pathway to citizenship.

Instead of making us more safe, these increased raids and executive orders instill fear in immigrants who are terrified they will be deported or have to give up information resulting in the deportation of their family members. For this reason, studies have shown Latinos are more than 40 percent less likely to call 911 when they have been a victim of a crime. This climate of fear drives people underground and into the shadows, making them less likely to report crimes against themselves or others. Fewer victims reporting crime and fewer witnesses coming forward. And these executive actions create a strain on local law enforcement. Any police

chief in this country will tell you they barely have enough resources to get their job done in their communities. So when you make local law enforcement do the job of the federal government, you strain the resources for local law enforcement. And that hurts everybody's safety.

And let's consider, the economic harm this order will cause. Immigrants make up 10% of California's workforce and contribute $130 billion to our state's gross domestic product. Immigrants own small businesses, they till the land, they care for children and the elderly, they work in our labs, attend our universities, and serve in our military. So these actions are not only cruel. They cause ripple effects that harm our public safety and our economy.

The same is true of this Muslim Ban. This ban may as well have been hatched in the basement headquarters of ISIS. We handed them a tool of recruitment to use against us. Policies that demonize entire groups of people based on the God they worship have a way of conjuring real life demons. And policies that isolate our Muslim American community take away one of the greatest weapons we have in the fight against home-grown extremism.

And here's the truth, Mr. President. Imperfect though we may be, I believe we are a great country. I believe we are a great country. And part of what makes us great are our democratic institutions that protect our fundamental ideals - freedom of religion and the rule of law, protection from discrimination based on national origin, freedom of the press, and a 200 year history as a nation built by immigrants.

So this brings me to my message today, we have a responsibility to draw a line with these administrative actions and say no. And this is not a question of party. This is about a government of co-equal branches with its inherent checks and balances. This is about the role of the United States Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the world. I know having spent now a few weeks in this chamber, that we have good men and women on both sides of the aisle, men and women who believe deeply in our immigrant communities and who understand that nationalism and patriotism are not the same thing. I know that it was the junior United States Senator from the State of Texas who said "it's an enormous blessing to be the child of an immigrant who fled oppression, because you realize how fragile liberty is and how easily it can be taken away." It was the junior United States Senator from the great State of Kentucky who said we "must always embrace individual liberty and enforce the constitutional rights of all Americans-

rich and poor, immigrant and native, black and white." It was the senior United States Senator from the great State of Arizona who said undocumented immigrants should not be "condemned forever to a twilight status."

So yes, we have good people on both sides of the aisle. And I say we must measure up to our words and fight for our ideals because the critical hour is upon us.

I thank you.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Global Warming: a Time to Act (2006)

by Dianne Feinstein

Speech at Town Hall Los Angeles, delivered on 25 October 2006.

Today, I am here to discuss global warming — the single greatest environmental challenge facing our planet. So let me explain the gravity of the situation station. The fuel we use to power our homes, our cars, and our businesses is causing the earth to warm faster than anyone expected.

The first seven months of this year, and the last three decades, were the warmest in the United States since national record-keeping began in 1895. And the Earth's temperature has climbed to the highest point it has been in the past 12,000 years.

A scientific consensus has been forged. There is broad agreement that the Earth will only get hotter. The question is how hot and why?

First, how hot?

If we act now and further temperature increases are kept to 1 to 2 degrees

Fahrenheit by the end of this century, the damages – though significant – will be manageable. But if we don't act, and warming increases by 5 to 9 degrees by the end of this century, the damage will be catastrophic and irreversible.

So we must act now.

Each of us is confronted with a choice: a choice that will impact not only our future, but the futures of our children and grandchildren. Do we continue with a business-as-usual attitude? Or do we make the changes necessary to prevent catastrophe?

Now for the question, why?

Quite simply, because we are addicted to fossil fuels. And it is the burning of these fuels – coal, oil, gasoline and natural gas and the greenhouse gases they produce – that is the primary cause of global warming.

Carbon dioxide is produced by power plants, cars, manufacturing, and to power residential and commercial buildings. And here is the key: Carbon dioxide doesn't dissipate. It stays in the atmosphere for five decades or more – causing the Earth's temperature to rise.

That means that the carbon dioxide produced in the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s is still in the atmosphere today. And the carbon dioxide produced today will still be in the atmosphere in 2050 and beyond.

And there will be serious consequences for our planet unless we make major changes. Leading scientists say that to stabilize the planet's climate by the end of the century, we need a 70 percent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions below 1990 levels by 2050.

So the goal should be to stabilize carbon dioxide at 450 parts per million by 2050. This could contain further warming to 1 to 2 degrees Fahrenheit.

The Earth has warmed 1 degree in the past century, and we are now seeing the dramatic effects:

Oceans are rising; coral reefs are dying; species are disappearing; glaciers are melting.

We learned just last week that Greenland is now losing 20% more mass than it receives from new snowfall each year. And it will shrink further as the planet warms.

Extreme weather patterns have emerged – heat waves, droughts, hurricanes, floods – and they are occurring with greater frequency and greater intensity.
In 2003, heat waves caused 20,000 deaths in Europe and 1,500 deaths in India.
And the number of Category 4 and 5 hurricanes has doubled since the 1970's.
Katrina alone is testament to that.
And things will only get worse as Earth's temperature rises. The question is: how much will the increase be?
If nothing is done…if the Earth warms 5 to 9 degrees Fahrenheit, the face of our planet will change forever.

The Greenland and Western Antarctic ice sheets would melt completely. These two ice sheets currently hold 20 percent of the Earth's fresh water.

Sea levels could well rise by 20 feet. Think about the damage that would cause to coastal areas around the world.

Additionally, hurricanes, tornadoes and other severe weather would become more volatile than ever. Malaria would spread.

Here in California: More than half of the Sierra snowpack would disappear. This is equal to the water supply for the 16 million people in the Los Angeles basin.

The rise in sea levels would cause catastrophic flooding – and the Los Angeles basin would be especially vulnerable.

Catastrophic wildfires would more than double.

We had a mild taste of that future in July. Here in Los Angeles, temperatures spiked to well above 100 degrees. And it was far worse in other areas of the State.

I met recently with scientists from the Scripps Institute of Oceanography.

And they said to me that if they have erred, it has been because their climate projections are too conservative and the Earth may be much closer to a tipping point than science has shown thus far.

And if we move beyond that tipping point, catastrophe becomes a certainty. You can't go back, because the carbon dioxide remains in the atmosphere for so long.

That's why we must act soon and decisively.

The question is: what should we do?

The United States emits some 25 percent of the world's greenhouse gases, and we're 4 percent of the world's population. So we are the big producer.

The largest contributor to global warming is electricity generation — 33 percent – followed by transportation — 28 percent. These two sectors combine to make up 61 percent of the problem.

The remaining contributors are:

Industry – 20 percent
Agriculture – 7 percent
Commercial – 6.5 percent
Residential – 6.5 percent

Let me be clear: there is no silver bullet. There is no one thing that we can do to solve the problem. Every business, home, and industry must do its share. So what can be done?

Let me begin with electricity generation. This is the single largest piece of the global warming puzzle —responsible for 33 percent of global warming gases in the United States . And the biggest culprit here is pulverized coal, which is the major source of energy in 40 of the 50 states.

Coal, alone, produces 27 percent of annual carbon dioxide emissions, or 2.1 billion tons every year.

Globally, coal produces 9.3 billion tons of carbon dioxide every year – or one-third of all global greenhouse gas emissions. So it's critical that we find ways to clean up coal.

Earlier this year, the Senate Energy Committee held a symposium on global

warming. The consensus was that a mandatory cap-and-trade program would be the most effective way forward. And so we are working to create such a program.

We would begin with two bills – one for electricity and one for industry.

Here's how it would work: we would cap the amount of global warming gases – including carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide – and that cap would be established on all major emitters.

In all likelihood, the cap would remain at present levels for a few years to give the industry the opportunity to make the changes necessary. Gradually, these caps would be tightened, and emissions reduced.

Electricity producers would have two ways to meet the cap:

Either implement new technologies, or
Purchase credits from other companies that have reduced their emissions below the target cap. (A credit essentially is an allowance to emit a ton of greenhouse gases.)
So, the cap would be met—and carbon dioxide would be reduced over time.

One of the key elements of our program is to put agriculture in the system. We would allow farmers and foresters to earn credits for moving to greener farming practices.

These include:

Tilling land less frequently;
Planting trees on vacant land; and
Converting crops to those that can be used for bio-fuels.
Farmers and growers would be able to earn dollars for acres converted to carbon sequestration and reduction.

Next we need to include other major industrial producers of carbon dioxide in a similar regime.

The fact of the matter is that cap and trade has worked before. It's not a revolutionary concept. Using the Clean Air Act, a cap-and-trade regime was implemented in the 1980s to reduce sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions

from electric utility plants in the northeast. These are the primary culprits of acid rain.

In the 16 years, this scheme has been in place, sulfur dioxide emissions have been reduced by about 34 percent (5 million tons) and nitrogen oxide emissions have been reduced by 43 percent (3 million tons). So cap and trade can be effective.

And, the governors of seven northeastern states are instituting a cap-and trade system known as the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. It will become effective in 2008.

The plan is to cap carbon dioxide emissions from electricity plants at current levels until 2015; and then begin reducing emissions incrementally to achieve a 10% reduction by 2019.

And last week, Governor Schwarzenegger announced that California may well join the Northeast regional system in the trading of credits.

At the same time, I am pleased to announce that I am very close to reaching agreement with the Clean Energy Group of utilities on a cap a trade regime for electricity.

The Clean Energy Group consists of PG&E, Florida Power and Light, Exelon, Entergy, Calpine, and Public Service Enterprise group.

These companies produce 15 percent of the energy consumed in the United States today – 150,000 megawatts out of the 1 million megawatts produced nationwide. This is enough energy to power 150 million homes.

I will be introducing the legislation in the new session of Congress.

Let me take up transportation — cars, trucks, planes, and cargo ships, which represents 28 percent of carbon dioxide emissions.

And passenger vehicles alone – cars, light-trucks, and SUVs – make up 20 percent of all U.S. emissions (1.2 tons).

Fundamentally, there are two ways to reduce these emissions.

1. Improve the fuel efficiency of vehicles.

2. Move away from oil and gasoline-based fuels and toward alternatives.

I believe we need to do both.

The good news is that the technology exists to significantly improve the fuel economy of these vehicles. The bad news is that Detroit and many foreign auto makers refuse to utilize the technologies.

So Senator Olympia Snowe of Maine and I have offered legislation that would require the mileage for all cars, pick-up trucks, and SUVs to be increased from 25 to 35 miles per gallon over the next 10 years.

We call it the "ten-by-ten" bill.

If this bill becomes law:

We would save 420 million metric tons of carbon dioxide by 2025. That is the equivalent of taking 90 million cars off the road in one year.
And we would save 2.5 million barrels of oil a day by 2025. By coincidence, this is the amount of oil imported daily from the Persian Gulf.
This is a simple solution, and it can be accomplished.

The other side of the transportation coin is new technologies and alternative fuels. As long as our nation continues its addiction to oil, we cannot sufficiently slow the warming trend. That's why we need to develop new, clean technologies and alternative fuels.

This includes the electric plug-in hybrid, biofuels, E-85 using cellulosic ethanol, and fuel cells.

The good news is that substantial venture capital funding is available today for clean energy projects. Here are just a few of the most promising:

Last week I visited a Silicon Valley start-up — Bloom Energy — that is developing clean fuel cells that will produce both electricity and hydrogen to fuel our vehicles.
The fuel cell has cathode ink on one side, anode ink on the other, separated by

zirconia sand covered plastic, which becomes the catalyst. The size is about 4 inches by 4 inches. It alone can power a 30 watt light bulb for 5 years.

Together these fuel cells can be combined to fit in a parking space, and can power a 20,000 square foot building.

The electricity is produced — with no carbon dioxide emissions – only water and hydrogen.

This is the future, and this is what we ought to be supporting.

It is also my understanding that Bill Gates has joined with venture capitalist Vinod Khosla to spearhead investment efforts in ethanol plants which, when completed, will produce 220 million gallons by 2009.
Others are investing in new ideas – inexpensive solar panels, windmills that can be built in your backyard for $10,000, and geothermal energy that harnesses the heat of the Earth.
Chevron has formed a strategic research alliance with the National Renewable Energy Lab in Colorado to advance the development of biofuels. It is also working with scientists at UC Davis to develop cellulosic ethanol.
And Los Angeles has become a "Climate Action Leader" and has registered its greenhouse gases and will be seeking to reduce its emissions.
These efforts are so important, and I want to encourage you to support them.

So that's the electricity and transportation sectors. But America needs to become much more energy efficient as well – both in terms of green building codes and individual conservation and energy use.

An aggressive energy national efficiency program could prevent a substantial amount of carbon dioxide going into the air.

This is the third prong of my proposal.

This would come from the incorporation of energy efficient building materials in construction – such as insulation, more efficient windows, and renewable technologies like solar or wind.

Green construction is also cost-effective. An initial $100,000 investment can result in a savings of $1 million or more over the life of a building of 20,000 square feet

– that's about the size of a Safeway or Borders bookstore.

And the bigger the building, the greater the potential savings.

Individuals can also make a difference. This means carpooling, using energy efficient light bulbs, and choosing ENERGY STAR appliances.

ENERGY STAR home products, such as air conditioners, furnaces, refrigerators, dishwashers, phones, DVD players, and televisions, must become standard for all Americans.

In 2005, these products saved consumers $12 billion, and reduced emissions by nearly 5 percent.

These are easy to do, and they can really make a major difference.

So early on in the 110th Congress, I plan to introduce a series of bills to meet these goals:

1. A mandatory cap-and-trade program for electricity.

A mandatory cap-and-trade program for industry.

2. Then "ten-by-ten bill," requiring increased mileage of 10 miles per gallon within the next 10 years. That means mileage would go from 25 to 35 miles per gallon.

3. An alternative fuels bill that requires 70 percent of all vehicles produced after 2014 to be flex-fuel capable. The cost is small, $100 per vehicle.

These vehicles would be required to have a green gas cap to show the owner that the car can accept other fuels.

We would also require that gas stations owned and operated by major oil companies have at least one pump that provides alternative fuels at every station.

4. The fourth bill will be a national energy efficiency program — including strict appliance and building standards and requiring utilities to use energy efficiency

measures to meet a portion of their demand.

5. Elimination of the protectionist tariff (54 cents per gallon) placed on Brazilian ethanol. This was done at the behest of the corn industry – to make imported ethanol non-competitive. It is estimated that Brazilian produced E-85 will be cheaper and work better.

And Senator Craig Thomas and I are working on a plan to use Wyoming Powder River Coal to produce cleaner electricity by sequestering carbon dioxide. The power will then be sold to Western States including California.

These bills are just the beginning.

Additionally, the U.S. must make addressing global warming a top priority and join the European Union and other nations in reducing emissions. We can, and must lead. But this won't solve the problem.

Here's why: the United States certainly leads in the production of greenhouse gases, but we are closely followed by China, Europe, Russia, Japan, and India. So all countries must participate.

The Kyoto Protocol is certainly not perfect, and it will expire in 2012. So the U.S. needs to gear up and be a leader.

At the same time, the United States should also lead an effort with China to create a public-private partnership fund to prioritize bilateral global warming projects.

China's coal use outpaces that of the United States, EU, and Japan combined. Coal accounts for 70 percent of China's energy needs. China is building a new pulverized coal power plant every week. China will soon pass the United States as the biggest emitter of carbon dioxide. If China continues its course, it could cause carbon dioxide levels to quadruple. So it's vital to engage China.

That is why a private/public partnership that funds key carbon dioxide reduction projects on a bilateral basis is so important.

The business community should consider investing in joint ventures to develop clean power quickly in China, as well as the United States.

Bottom line: now is the time to act.

And here’s what I’d like to ask you to do. Please support these bills.

Let the members of the House and the Senate you support them.

Right now, the mentality of the congress is do-nothing, and it won’t work.

The choice is clear. It is time to stop talking and to begin acting.

Thank you.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Introduction of the "Select Agent Program and Biosafety Improvement Act of 2008"

by Jane Margaret Lakes Harman

Congressional Record: July 30, 2008 (Extensions of Remarks) Page E1623. From the Congressional Record Online via GPO Access [wais.access.gpo.gov] [DOCID:cr30jy08-100]

INTRODUCTION OF THE ``SELECT AGENT PROGRAM AND BIOSAFETY IMPROVEMENT
ACT OF 2008

_____

HON. JANE HARMAN

of california

in the house of representatives

Wednesday, July 30, 2008

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, today my colleague Mike Rogers of Michigan and I are introducing the House companion to a bill introduced by Senators Burr and Kennedy--the Select Agent Program and Biosafety Improvement Act.

The bill will provide an important link in the chain of defenses needed to fight the potential threat of bioterrorism.

The bill reauthorizes and updates the Select Agent Program, which limits access to and controls the transfer of dangerous biological agents and toxins.

It requires the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the program, and recommend ways in which it can be restructured to enhance biosecurity and international scientific collaboration.

It requires that the program consider newly discovered agents--such as genetically modified organisms, synthetic compounds, and other agents identified in Homeland Security risk assessments--to ensure that the list of agents is current and comprehensive.

It encourages the sharing of information with state emergency planning officials, which is vital to ensuring that our first responders have the tools they need to prevent or respond to an attack.

And it ensures minimum biosecurity and biosafety standards for the training of workers in the laboratories that deal with the most dangerous substances.

These measures are of vital importance. Over the past several decades we have seen revolutions in technology, economics, and politics that are fundamentally changing the world we live in.

The upside of these developments is obvious. The world is more prosperous, healthy, and interconnected than it has ever been before. But with these revolutions also come challenges.

The same advances in biotechnology that help save lives, can also be used to develop dangerous biological agents and toxins that can take lives.

The new global information infrastructure that is now the backbone of our economy can be used to spread knowledge of how to create and disperse biological weapons.

It is more important than ever that the U.S. government be able to

track and control the dangerous materials that can be used to construct these weapons. This bill will help that effort.

In closing, I'd like to say a special word about Senator Kennedy. He has been a legislative hero of mine since my days working as a staffer on the Senate Judiciary Committee. He and Vicki are good friends, and are in my prayers.

Rep. Rogers has amassed an impressive amount of knowledge on this subject, and will play a major role in securing its passage.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Question of Personal Privilege (2012)

by Carolyn Bosher Maloney

Source: 2012 Congressional Record, Vol. 158, Pg. H1599 www.gpo.gov

HON. CAROLYN BOSHER MALONEY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 2012

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Chaffetz). The Chair has been made aware of a valid basis for the gentlewoman's point of personal privilege.

The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an attack on my integrity and my reputation.

Last week, Representative Darrell Issa, the chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, on which I have served for many years, gave an interview to a newspaper in San Diego. The story was published on March 21, and it quoted the gentleman as accusing me of lying, knowingly and intentionally, during a hearing that was held before the Oversight Committee on February 16.

That hearing received a significant amount of public attention because it addressed the issue of insurance for reproductive health care, yet included no witness testifying on behalf of the tens of millions of women across this country who seek access to coverage for reproductive health and contraception.

I certainly understand that Members on both sides of the aisle have different viewpoints on this issue, and I'm not here to discuss the underlying policy differences we may have.

Today I ask from Mr. Issa the same commitment I ask of myself, to always strive to hear from all sides of a debate without resorting to name-calling or attacks on the personal integrity of others. Even when we disagree with what others might say, we have an obligation to listen to them and respect their viewpoints.

I am sure there are some who will accuse me of using these remarks to merely revisit the contraception issue. To the contrary, I am responding to statements published just last week by the gentleman from California, his arguments regarding my actions.

In his recent interview on the hearing, Mr. Issa said this, to be absolutely clear, and I quote:

> *Carolyn Maloney then made the famous statement, Where are the women? That was an outright lie, and she knew it when she said it.*

First of all, I would like to point out that what I actually offered was an outright question. I asked it as I sat there looking directly at an all-male panel, the panel that you see in this now-famous picture. It is a picture that I believe is worth a thousand words.

And as I look at this picture again, my question is as pertinent and legitimate today as it was back then. Look at this picture and tell me, Where are the women? If you

can point to one woman on this first panel, then I will happily withdraw and offer my apologies to Mr. Issa.

Just to make sure we have my question in context, let me repeat remarks that I made that morning that Mr. Issa and some found so objectionable. I said, and I quote:

> *What I want to know is, Where are the women? I look at this panel, and I don't see one single individual representing the tens of millions of women across this country who want and need insurance coverage for basic preventive health care services, including family planning and contraception. Where are the women?*

I still maintain, without fear of any contradiction, there is no one on this panel who is a woman, or who represents the tens of millions of women who want and need insurance basic coverage for family planning.

Now, if Mr. Issa believes or tries to argue that that statement is somehow false because there were two women witnesses who appeared later that day on a second and separate panel, I would draw his attention to the fact that those witnesses were not there to represent the woman's point of view that is upheld primarily by the Democratic Party on this particular issue.

Those Republican-appointed witnesses were there only to represent the interests of institutions. So even in surveying both panels, I don't see one single individual representing the tens of millions of women across this country who want and need insurance coverage for basic preventive health care services, including family planning.

In conclusion, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, rising for a point of personal privilege is sometimes accompanied by a call for a personal apology. Earlier today, Mr. Issa apologized to me, and he sent me this letter just an hour or two ago. I am encouraged by his actions, and I accept his apology.

In the fallout of that unfortunate hearing, women were called far worse than liars. I know what I said that day, and I know it to be true. But I do think the Democratic witness, Sandra Fluke, and the women of America are owed an apology, an apology for denying them a voice, an apology for denying them a seat at the table.

It was wrong then, and it is wrong each time that it happens. And it is especially wrong when women's health, women's lives, and women's rights are being discussed. And to cavalierly dismiss or deny that fact does greater damage to the fabric of democracy than words can ever redress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Senator-Elect Al Franken (2009)

by Amy Jean Klobuchar

Source: 2009 Congressional Record, Vol. 155, Pg. S7167 www.gpo.gov

SEN. AMY KLOBUCHAR

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE

July 7, 2009

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, today, a new Senator from Minnesota is being sworn in. It is my honor, along with former Vice President Mondale, to escort Al Franken as the new Senator from our State. I think it was Al who told me the third year of his campaign would be the best, and he was right.

I did want to thank my staff, first of all--some of them, many of them, are here--for the hard work they did in the past 6 months doing double duty. They never complained, they did it without extra resources, and they are as happy as can be this has finally been resolved.

I also wanted to say something about Norm Coleman. Last week, he made a difficult decision. He had the right to pursue a legal challenge, but he did what was right for Minnesota. Norm was my Senate colleague for 2 years. We often worked

together on issues for Minnesota, and we all wish him and his family the best.

So despite a little delay, to be exact, 246 days since election day and 183 days since the Senate convened--why would I know that--Al Franken now joins me in representing the State of Minnesota. I have gotten to know Al very well over the past few years. I know he will be getting acquainted with his fellow Senators in the coming weeks and the coming months. This a special place with special people. I know Al looks forward to working with every Member of the Senate.

I also know Al arrived in Washington ready to get to work and ready to serve the people of Minnesota. He brings with him that same high energy and passion and idealism of our friend Paul Wellstone.

I was telling Al when I first came to the Capitol I was stunned at how many people would come up to me, when I said I was a Senator from Minnesota, and say: That is where Paul Wellstone was from. It was not just other Senators, it was people such as the tram operators, the secretaries at the front desk, the cops who work on the front line. They remembered Paul because of his dignity and how he treated people. And Al, I know, will do the same.

Before seeking elected office, Al had a full career. Among other things he was an Emmy Award-winning television writer and producer, a best-selling author with three of his books going to the very top of the New York Times Bestseller List. He was the host of a national radio show and a Grammy Award-winning satirist, who, with the USO, has gone overseas several times--seven times in fact. He went four times to Iraq to entertain our troops and to visit our wounded solders.

We all know Al spent some time in comedy, but during this long campaign, he has demonstrated to Minnesotans that he takes his job very seriously. I know he is taking his new job as a Senator incredibly seriously.

Al's heart is with middle-class families who work hard, live responsibly, and follow the rules. He knows their hopes and fears, their dreams and their struggles. He knows it because he has lived it.

When Al was 4 his family moved to the town of Albert Lea in southern Minnesota. Al always tells the story about that move. His dad never graduated from high school and never had a career. But his mom's father owned a quilting business out East, and he gave Al's dad a chance to start up a factory in Albert Lea. After about

2 years the factory failed, and Al's family moved to the Twin Cities. Years later, Al asked his dad: Dad, why Albert Lea?

His dad said: Well, your grandfather wanted to open a factory in the Midwest, and the railroad went right through Albert Lea.

So then Al asked: Why did the factory fail?

His father said: Well, it went through Albert Lea, but it didn't stop in Albert Lea.

Eventually the family, including Al and his older brother, settled into a two-bedroom, one-bathroom home in the Minneapolis suburb of St. Louis Park. His father became a printing salesman and his mom was a homemaker and worked as a real estate agent. Because of the security and opportunity his family enjoyed living in America, he says he felt like the "luckiest kid in the world."

While Al likes to tell jokes, and he has some good ones, he is not one to make fun of family values because there is no husband or father who is more devoted to his family than Al is.

He met his wife--I see her right now up there in the gallery--Franni during his first year at college. They have been married 33 years, and together they have raised two children.

Al often tells the story about Franni's family. Her dad, a decorated World War II veteran, died in a car accident when she was 17 months old. Her dad left her mom suddenly widowed and alone with five children.

It was a lesson for the family, and it was an example of how one family pulled themselves up with help. He knows how difficult it is for so many families who are struggling to make it, squeezed over high health care costs, college costs, housing costs.

During the past 2 years, Al has traveled to every corner of Minnesota, from the Iowa border to the Canadian border. He has had coffee at the Main Street cafes, and he has spoken at local bean feeds. He has toured homegrown businesses, and he has stood with workers. He has been to veterans halls, and he has gone to college campuses.

He has been there day in and day out listening to the people of Minnesota. Now he has the honor and the responsibility to serve them in the U.S. Capitol. The Senate is an old and established institution. For any newcomer, it takes some getting used to the arcane rules and unique customs, but I am confident Al can adapt.

This is a big moment for Franni and their kids as well. Al and his friends and relatives have been waiting for a while. The State has been waiting. The Senate has been waiting. But, most importantly to me, Franni has been waiting.

My favorite image from the last few months was this idea that Franni had actually packed a bag with her toothbrush in it; that she had it right next to her bedside in case at any moment the court would come with a decision and she and Al would have to rush to Washington so he could take a critical vote.

Well, today the time has come and Al will cast his first vote. If there is any silver lining to the past 8 months, it is that Al has had time to prepare for this moment. The times are tumultuous, the stakes are high, and history will forever judge whether we fail or succeed, whether we are courageous or timid.

Al Franken is ready for this job. It is time to get to work, and, Al Franken, there is a desk waiting for you in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

The Increased Mental Health Needs of Our Returning Soldiers and Veterans (2004)

by Graciela Flores Napolitano

Source: 2004 Congressional Record, Vol. 150, Pg. E1965

The Increased Mental Health Needs of Our Returning Soldiers and Veterans

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 9, 2004

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, October 3 through October 9 is Mental Illness Awareness Week. During this week, it is critical that Members of Congress and the American public recognize the increased mental health needs of our returning soldiers and veterans.

As co-Chair of the Congressional Mental Health Caucus, I rise today to express my strong support for expansion of the mental health benefits offered to our veterans and the men and women currently serving in our armed services. Those who have witnessed the atrocities of war must have professional assistance to deal with the traumatic memories that they are going to live with for the rest of their lives. These traumatic memories can lead to post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD, a dangerous biological condition affecting a soldier's body, mind, and certainly family. Unfortunately, soldiers returning home often do not receive the comprehensive care they need. Some even sign their rights-to-service away.

Many of the soldiers who served in recent wars in the Middle East have a desperate need for mental health services. Here are some alarming statistics. Out of 15,000 veterans returning from the Middle East who have utilized VA healthcare services, 12 percent presented symptoms related to psychological trauma. It is estimated that more than 25 percent of troops returning from Iraq are being examined for mental health concerns. These are startling statistics and dramatically demonstrate the need for more mental health services.

We must concern ourselves that many soldiers find it difficult to obtain treatment or fail to seek help because of the stigma attached to mental illness due to a lack of sensitivity. Just look at our jails and our homeless population. Our communities and our social service system are affected, yet we refuse to admit a problem exists.

I am also deeply troubled and concerned, as are many women Members of Congress, with our returning women soldiers who may have been exposed to the traumatic experience of sexual assault. For example, a horrendous 8 percent of female Gulf War Veterans experienced an attempted or completed sexual assault during deployment. The PTSD from sexual assault is just as harmful as combat related PTSD. This must cease immediately.

In the past three decades, the Veterans' Administration has taken great strides toward better mental care services for men and women, and there is now a better understanding of PTSD because of research conducted through the VA health system. More remains to be done. Twenty-five years ago, the VA offered no PTSD services, no Vet Centers, no homeless services. Today these services exist though limited. However, many veterans will not benefit from these services because of a lack of access. There are just not enough Vet Centers, and the need for services will only continue to grow as a result of U.S. involvement throughout the world.

Additional funding for the VA health system must be appropriated to improve access to care. The President's proposal of funding increase of only 2 percent for the VA health system does not even cover increases in cost of living and is insufficient even to maintain the inadequate current level services. The demand on PTSD services has not kept up with the increase need of services. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have greatly increased the need for these vital services. Some veterans who need weekly or biweekly follow-up appointments for therapy are forced to wait weeks, and in many cases even months. This is unconscionable. The VA does not have enough mental health professionals due in part to lack of funding, and the President's low funding proposal will exacerbate this problem. Our returning soldiers and veterans deserve better from their government. They have earned what was promised them.

The Bush administration has repeatedly emphasized that the war in Iraq is not another Vietnam. However, by not providing veterans the necessary mental health resources, we can assure the same high rates of suicide that existed among Vietnam veterans. As we conclude our recognition of mental illness awareness this week, we will continue our fight to ensure that our veterans and service personnel

will be able to receive the mental health services they deserve. Their sacrifice for our beloved country paid for them.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Women's Health in the Twilight Zone (2012)

by Gwendolynne Sophia Moore

Source: 2012 Congressional Record, Vol. 158, Pg. H972 www.gpo.gov

Document in the Congressional Record, February 28, 2012.
Women's Health in the Twilight Zone

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. Moore) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, lately, I along with many other women have felt like we're a mere supporting cast in an episode of The Twilight Zone. I can just hear the narration of the show saying: "You're traveling through another dimension, a dimension not only of sight and sound, but of mind. That is the signpost up ahead: Your next stop, the Twilight Zone."

The rhetoric espoused over the last few weeks by many conservatives has me feeling as if I'm in an alternative political universe where men say the most oddly absurd things about what women should be doing with their bodies. In this

universe, the House Committee on Government Oversight and Reform holds hearings on women's health and contraception with a panel made up completely of men.

This may seem odd to you folks out there in the real world; but in this alternate reality, it makes perfectly good sense that a bunch of middle-aged men, devoid of ovaries and uteruses, would be experts on women's reproductive health. In this alternate universe, you wouldn't dare ask a woman to testify on women's health and what it means to be a woman. You wouldn't invite them to talk about what it means to be susceptible to pregnancy for approximately 30 years of their lives and how important birth control is to women who wish to prevent unintended pregnancies and to preserve their health. You surely wouldn't ask a woman to testify about how birth control has helped them prevent various diseases or manage diseases like endometriosis.

While it would be nice to believe we're in the twilight zone, the recent ploys of Republicans against women's health are all frighteningly too real. In reality, this hearing did take place with the House Government Oversight and Reform Committee blocking the testimony of women, women like Georgetown University law student Sandra Fluke, who later testified during a special hearing convened by Democratic Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi of a fellow female student at Georgetown University who had been denied contraception coverage because of the university's Catholic affiliation. Her friend experienced complications stemming from ovarian cysts that could have been treated with birth control. Sadly, due to nontreatment, doctors eventually were forced to remove her ovary.

There are so many stories just like this that need to be told; but, sadly, you won't hear them on Capitol Hill if my Republican colleagues in the majority have anything to do with it. They are too busy silencing women's voices on these very critical issues.

What if there was a hearing held on access to Viagra or vasectomies with a panel of experts being a group of six women? Could you imagine the outrage if women were allowed to legislate what happens to men's bodies? The horror.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, this twilight zone is real. This attack on women's health is real, but the battle is not over. We cannot and will not allow a few to silence the voices of millions of women across this country. We must continue to stand up for women and their reproductive health.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Rep Zoe Lofgren Introduces Bipartisan Aaron's Law (2013)

by Zoe Lofgren

Rep Zoe Lofgren Introduces Bipartisan Aaron's Law. Zoe Lofgren. (June 20, 2013). lofgren.house.gov. http://lofgren.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=365647.

Rep. Zoe Lofgren

June 20, 2013

Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-CA), along with Reps. James Sensenbrenner (R-WI), Mike Doyle (D-PA), Yvette Clarke (D-NY) and Jared Polis (D-CO), have introduced H.R. 2454, the Aaron's Law Act of 2013. Named in honor of the late Internet innovator and activist Aaron Swartz, the bipartisan legislation would reform the quarter-century old Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (CFAA) to work for the digital age. Swartz's passing in January spotlighted serious problems with the vague wording of the CFAA. Among those concerns is how the law treats violations of terms of service, employer agreements, or website notices.

"Reform of the CFAA is necessary," Rep. Lofgren said. "I hope this bipartisan bill will lead to the reforms that are needed for the good of the country."

Aaron's Law refocuses the CFAA away from common computer and Internet activity and back towards targeting damaging hacks, as originally intended. By establishing a clear line that is needed in the law, it distinguishes the difference between common online activities and harmful attacks. Specifically the legislation:

Establishes that mere breach of terms of service, employment agreements, or contracts are not automatic violations of the CFAA. By using legislative language based closely on recent important 9th and 4th Circuit Court opinions, the bill would instead define 'access without authorization' under the CFAA as gaining

unauthorized access to information by circumventing technological or physical controls — such as password requirements, encryption, or locked office doors. Hack attacks such as phishing, injection of malware or keystroke loggers, denial-of-service attacks, and viruses would continue to be fully prosecutable under strong CFAA provisions this bill does not modify.
Brings balance back to the CFAA by eliminating a redundant provision that enables an individual to be punished multiple times through duplicate charges for the same solitary violation. Eliminating the redundant provision streamlines the law, but would not create a gap in protection against hackers.
Brings greater proportionality to CFAA penalties. Currently, the CFAA's penalties are tiered, and prosecutors have wide discretion to ratchet up the severity of the penalties in several circumstances, leaving little room for non-felony charges under CFAA (i.e., charges with penalties carrying less than a year in prison). The bill ensures prosecutors cannot seek to inflate sentences by stacking multiple charges under the CFAA, including state law equivalents or non-criminal violations of the law.
The bill also has companion legislation introduced in the Senate by Senator Ron Wyden (D-OR). Click here for the text of Aaron's Law. Click here for a detailed summary of the legislation.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Authorizing Use of United States Armed Forces Against Those Responsible for Recent Attacks Against the United States (2001)

by Barbara Lee

from the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives on 14 September 2001. Rep. Lee was the sole member of Congress to vote against the Authorization for Use of Military Force. The text is formatted as published in the Congressional Record by the United States Government Printing Office and modified to reflect her speech as delivered.

Thank you. I want to thank our ranking member and my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, members, I rise today really with a very heavy heart, one that is filled with sorrow for the families and the loved ones who were killed and injured this week. Only the most foolish and the most callous would not understand the grief that has really gripped our people and millions across the world.

This unspeakable act on the United States has really forced me, however, to rely on my moral compass, my conscience, and my God for direction. September 11 changed the world. Our deepest fears now haunt us. Yet I am convinced that military action will not prevent further acts of international terrorism against the United States. This is a very complex and complicated matter.

Now, this resolution will pass, although we all know that the President can wage a war even without it. However difficult this vote may be, some of us must urge the use of restraint. Our country is in a state of mourning. Some of us must say, let's step back for a moment. Let's just pause just for a minute and think through the implications of our actions today so that this does not spiral out of control.

Now, I have agonized over this vote, but I came to grips with it today and I came to grips with opposing this resolution during the very painful, yet very beautiful, memorial service, as a member of the clergy so eloquently said, "As we act, let us not become the evil that we deplore."[1]

Thank you, and I yield the balance of my time.

Note
"Let us also pray for divine wisdom as our leaders consider the necessary actions for national security, wisdom of the grace of God, that as we act we not become the evil we deplore."

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Representative Eleanor Holmes Norton opening statement on contraception (2012)

by Eleanor Holmes Norton

February 23, 2012. United States House of Representatives. Democratic Steering and Policy Committee. Hearing on Women's Health. Opening Statement.

Representative Eleanor Holmes Norton opening statement on contraception

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF WASHINGTON, D.C.
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 23, 2012

Thank you very much, Leader Pelosi.

Yes, I have a vote in this committee, and I called for a vote when women – our witness, Sandra Fluke was excluded.

It's important to remember how the hearing occurred in the first place. The hearing arose out of a controversy that had two sides – two compelling sides – religious liberty and reproductive freedom.

By the time the hearing had been called, we are fortunate that the administration had worked a compromise that in fact allows women to receive their contraceptive insurance while at the same time recognizing the religious concerns of religiously-affiliated institutions, such as universities and hospitals, who under the accommodation do not have to pay at all for contraceptives, which are now to be received through the insurance company, and have no involvement with contraceptives.

This is very important to bear in mind, because in my more than 20 years in the House of Representatives I have seldom seen a compromise that worked out a issue of such importance to both sides as favorably as this compromise did.

The committee appeared to want to exploit the religious side of the issue. By excluding the only witness that the Democrats requested, Sandra Fluke was essentially defined out of last week's hearing. In defining her out of the hearing and having a hearing about only one side of a clearly two-sided issue, the majority managed to defined out most American women.

The silent majority represented by Sandra Fluke was not at the table last week. I am very pleased, Madam Leader, that you have convened us here so that the concerns of women can be heard through their representative, Sandra Fluke, this morning.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

In Recognition of the Second Anniversary of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (2012)

by Laura Richardson

Source: 2012 Congressional Record, Vol. 158, Pg. E404 www.gpo.gov

Speech in Congressional Record, March 21, 2012.
In Recognition of the Second Anniversary of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 2012

In Recognition of the Second Anniversary of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the second anniversary of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. In the two years since its enactment, the Affordable Care Act has been good for seniors, good for women, good for small businesses, and good for all Americans.

As the Affordable Care Act is implemented, it will continue to expand access to affordable, quality health care for over 30 million Americans and will work to reign in the ever-escalating costs of health care. Passage of the Affordable Care Act was a major step toward fulfilling the promise all Americans were pledged: the promise of unalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness which quality healthcare embodies.

For the people I represent in the 37th District of California, the Affordable Care Act will improve coverage for 299,000 residents who already have insurance. It will give tax credits and other assistance to up to 146,000 families and 15,100 small businesses to help them afford coverage. Health care reform will also improve Medicare for 63,000 beneficiaries in my district, including closing the prescription drug "donut hole" once and for all.

In 2010, the Affordable Care Act made it possible for 354,592 Medicare beneficiaries in California to receive a $250 rebate to help cover the cost of their prescription drugs when they hit the donut hole. In 2011, 319,429 Medicare beneficiaries received a 50 percent discount—an average savings of $538 per person—on brand-name prescription drugs when they hit the coverage gap. That's a total savings of over $171 million for seniors in California alone! In my district, 3,200 seniors received prescription drug discounts worth $1.5 million, an average discount of $460 per senior.

The Affordable Care Act extends coverage to 92,500 uninsured residents of the 37th District and will guarantee that 17,500 residents with pre-existing conditions can obtain the health insurance they need. Since enactment, health care reform has extended insurance coverage to 5,599 Californians through the new Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan.

The Affordable Care Act protects 1,100 families from bankruptcy due to unaffordable health care costs and currently allows 59,000 young adults to obtain coverage on their parents' insurance plans. The new law provides millions of dollars in new funding for 11 community health centers in my district. And finally, it will reduce the cost of uncompensated care for hospitals and other health care

providers by $125 million annually.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the two year anniversary of the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, an attack on women's access to affordable, quality, and necessary healthcare services is underway. From the comments made by Rush Limbaugh about Georgetown Law Student Sandra Fluke, to Republican attempts to roll back coverage and restrict access to birth control, the GOP's war on women stands in stark contrast to the Administration's goal of ensuring that women have access to the healthcare services they need to remain healthy.

As a female Member of Congress, I understand that women have unique health care needs, and are often the ones who make health care decisions for their families. I voted for and strongly support the Affordable Care Act because it provides important benefits for women and their families. The Affordable Care Act helps women by eliminating the discriminatory gender rating system, making sure that insurance companies do not consider pregnancy grounds for denying coverage, and doing away with all pre-existing conditions.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, all Americans joining new insurance plans have the freedom to choose from any primary care provider, OB-GYN, or pediatrician in their health plan's network, or emergency care outside of the plan's network, without a referral. Under the Affordable Care Act, women joining a new health care plan can receive recommended preventive services, like mammograms, new baby care and well-child visits, and an annual wellness visit with no out-of-pocket costs. In 2011, over 6 million people with private insurance coverage in California gained preventative service coverage with no cost sharing as a result of the Affordable Care Act.

Before enactment of the Affordable Care Act, women could be charged more for individual insurance policies simply because of their gender. A 22-year-old woman could be charged 150 percent the premium that a 22-year-old man paid. In 2014, insurers will not be able to charge women higher premiums than they charge men. The law takes strong action to control health care costs, including helping states crack down on excessive premium increases and making sure most of your premium dollars go toward your health care.

The Affordable Care Act also allows young adults under the age of 26 to stay on their parents' health insurance plan. This provision has expanded access to health insurance coverage for 2.5 million young people nationwide. In my district, 7,000

young adults have taken advantage of this provision and are now covered under their parents' plan.

This week, the House will consider a bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board established under the Affordable Care Act. Having previously garnered bipartisan support, the majority's decision to attach a medical liability provision to the underlying piece of legislation amounts to nothing short of a partisan ploy to score points with their base.

The language attached to the bill would place caps on medical malpractice awards for pain and suffering at $250,000 and would override most state tort laws. Unfortunately, the majority's decision to include tort reform language on a completely unrelated measure demonstrates their refusal to work with Members across the aisle in order to further strengthen the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act provides American families with stability and peace of mind. Never again will they have to choose between their health and their livelihood. As a result of the Affordable Care Act, 23,000 children and 90,000 adults in my district now have health insurance that covers preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductibles.

I am proud to be a part of this historic health care policy change, and to be part of the days ahead in which we will work to further strengthen it.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Tribute to the National Foundation for Women Legislators

by Diane Edith Watson

Source: 2007 Congressional Record, Vol. 153, Pg. E1989{{{3}}}

HON. DIANE E. WATSON

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 2007

Ms. WATSON. I would like to congratulate the National Foundation for Women Legislators for working to distribute thousands of backpacks filled with school supplies in every U.S. State and Puerto Rico.

These backpacks have been donated by Office Depot and are being distributed to at-risk and disadvantaged youth. As lawmakers we introduce and pass legislation every year that affects our Nation's youth. We talk about statistics and reading performance and free lunch programs, but we do not talk enough about ensuring that all students have the school supplies they need to perform both inside and out of the classroom.

Office Depot's National Backpack Program, now in its seventh year, is designed to make a difference in communities across the country and put backpacks in the hands of underprivileged and ``at-risk children so they have the tools they need to start the school year. Beginning in 2001 with 80,000 backpacks donated nationwide, the program has expanded to deliver 100,000 backpacks in 2002 and in 2003 and 2004, the program was increased to 200,000 backpacks containing school supplies. In 2005, the program grew to 300,000 backpacks with school supplies and finally, in 2006, 300,000 backpacks were again donated by Office Depot across North America and in Puerto Rico, totaling more than 1 million backpacks in the hands of children since the inception of the program.

Sadly, there are hundreds of thousands of children who can not afford the basic supplies they need for school. This backpack initiative not only alleviates some of the financial burden from the many single- family households that are stretching their budget and have enough to worry about paying for food and bills, but it also allows their children to have the pride of being able to start the school year the right way.

I am proud to say that 1,000 backpacks will be delivered to the Bradley Elementary School in my home district. I ask all of my colleagues in this United States Congress to join me in recognizing the National Foundation for Women Legislators and their partnership with Office Depot, whose efforts to empower our children and provide them the tools they need to be successful in school and in life are to be commended.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Women's Health Care (2012)

by Jeanne Shaheen

Source: 2012 Congressional Record, Vol. 158, Pg. S882 www.gpo.gov

Contents

1 Senator Jeanne Shaheen
2 Senator Patty Murray
3 Senator Kirsten Gillibrand
4 Senator Barbara Boxer
(5th senator redacted from this document)

Document in the Congressional Record. February 17, 2012.
Women's Health Care

SENATOR Jeanne Shaheen

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE

February 17, 2012

WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President I come to the floor today with a number of my women Senate colleagues to talk about what happened yesterday at the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. They held a hearing on the administration's decision to make sure that women have access to affordable contraception, but guess who was missing. The women. This is a picture of the first panel from yesterday's hearing. Not one woman was seated at this table, not one woman at the table, yet the topic was women's health.

What is more difficult to understand is that when female members of the House committee asked for a woman to testify along with the men, they were denied. Their request was simple: to allow Sandra Fluke, a Georgetown Law School student, to testify on this panel of all men. As a woman she could speak firsthand about how this rule would impact women. But their request was denied because the chairman said Sandra Fluke was unqualified.

How can a woman be unqualified to talk about women's health care? Yet every one of these men on the panel was deemed to be qualified to talk about women's health care. I am disappointed. I know it is a disappointment that is shared by millions of women across this country. I am saddened that here we are, in 2012, and a House committee would hold a hearing on women's health and deny women the ability to share their perspective.

Time and time again, women have been silenced in this discussion, a discussion about our own very personal health care decisions. In fact, a recent analysis of the leading cable news channels showed that almost twice as many men as women were invited to join the conversation.

I think it is critical to understand that the underlying issue here is about affordable access to contraception--something that is basic to women's health. Birth control is something that most women use at some point in their lifetime and something that the medical community believes is essential to the health of women and their families. Research shows that access to birth control is directly linked to declines in maternal and infant mortality, that it can reduce the risk of ovarian cancer, and that it is linked to overall good health outcomes.

Some women, 14 percent of them, use birth control not as contraceptives but to treat serious medical conditions. That is about 1.5 million women.

When the administration first announced its decision to require employers to offer health insurance coverage for contraception, there was a robust conversation about religious liberty. In response to that, the President modified his decision last week, preserving the religious liberty of those religiously affiliated institutions, such as hospitals or universities, but also protecting the women who work for them. His decision ensured that all women have access to contraceptive coverage, and if a woman's employer has a religious objection, women can get that critical coverage directly from their health plans.

The Catholic Health Association has supported this policy, and yet, as we saw yesterday, some attempt to continue to politicize this issue. We cannot lose sight that this is at the most fundamental level of debate about women's preventive health.

Women deserve a voice in this debate because, after all, in the end this is about our health and it is about a health care decision that is between women, their families, their doctors, and their own faith.

I yield the floor.

Senator Patty Murray
SENATOR Patty Murray

OF WASHINGTON

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New Hampshire.

For millions of American women, reading the news this morning was like stepping into a time machine and going back 50 years, seeing the headlines and the photos of this all-male panel in the House talking about a woman's right to access birth control, and no women on the panel. It turns out the chairman of the House oversight committee decided he was not going to allow a young woman who had been asked by the minority to testify and tell her story--actually of a friend who had lost an ovary because of her lack of contraception coverage. So this 19-year-old woman was left to watch, like the rest of us, as all five men addressed the committee about how they supported efforts to restrict access to care.

I am sure by now many of my colleagues here have seen this picture of this all-male panel, the picture that says a thousand words. It is one that most women thought was left behind when pictures only came in black and white.

But this was not the only story this morning that made women feel as if the clock had been turned back on them. The other story comes to us from the Republican Presidential nomination trail. It seems that yesterday, on national television, one of the chief financial backers for Rick Santorum, the Republican candidate who is

now surging toward the nomination, suggested that contraception was once as simple as a woman putting aspirin between her knees. Really? Shocking. Appalling. An insult. In fact, both of these stories are enough to make any woman, regardless of her own politics, angry. It certainly does me.

These are things that are happening today and they are enough to make you believe that after years of progress, nothing has changed. For many women and men who are waking up to the news this morning, it may seem this is a swift and sudden attack on women's health care, but I am here on the floor of the Senate today to tell you all there is nothing sudden about it. There is nothing new about these Republican attacks on our family planning decisions. In fact, from the moment they came into power, Republicans in the House of Representatives have been waging a war on women's health. If you do not believe me, look at the first bills they introduced after they arrived here in Washington, DC, and were sworn into office. After campaigning across the country on a platform of jobs and the economy, the first three bills they introduced were direct attacks on women's health in America.

The very first bill, H.R. 1, would have totally eliminated title X funding for family planning and teen pregnancy prevention. It included an amendment that would have completely defunded Planned Parenthood and cut off support for millions of women who count on it.

Another one of their opening round of bills, more than a year ago, would have permanently codified the Hyde amendment and the DC abortion ban, and the original version of their bill did not even include an exception for the health of the mother.

Finally, they introduced a bill right away that would have rolled back every single one of the gains we worked so hard to get for women in the health care reform bill. It would have removed the caps on out- of-pocket expenses that protect women from losing their homes and their life savings if they get sick. It ended the ban on lifetime limits on coverage. It allowed insurance companies to once again discriminate against women by charging them higher premiums or even denying women access for so-called preexisting conditions--that, by the way, includes pregnancy.

It would have rolled back the guarantee that insurance companies cover contraceptive activities, which will save the overwhelming majority of women

who use them hundreds of dollars a year.

In addition to showing their true colors with their very first legislative efforts, Republicans have shown they will go to about any limit to restrict our access to care, even shutting down the Federal Government. It seems extreme? That is exactly what happened last April, when Republicans nearly shuttered the Federal Government over a rider that was another attempt to go after title X and Planned Parenthood.

I remember, I was in those meetings, months and months of negotiations on the numbers in our budget. I was astonished that Republicans, late at night, were willing to throw all that work away to go after women's health. I was the only woman in the room that night. I can remember being personally disgusted that Republicans thought they could get away with making women victims, under the cover of darkness, in the middle of the night, with moments to go before the government was shut down.

But I also remember the resounding ``no when they tried to pull that, first from me, then from my women colleagues joining me today, and then a loud and overwhelming chorus of men and women all across the country. That chorus of women was heard again a few weeks ago after yet another attack on women's health care. This time the attack came cloaked in a sham investigation led by some of the same congressional Republicans who yesterday had this all-male panel talking about women's contraception. It was an investigation of the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer charity sites to cut off funding for lifesaving breast cancer screenings for women. We know what happened after the outcry followed that decision. I certainly remember going home and standing shoulder to shoulder with women and men in my home State in front of a clinic that provided those breast screening referrals and pledging to safeguard against any future attacks in the wake of that decision, but I didn't think it would come the very next week. Apparently, Republicans are still not done. Even after the loud rebuke after the Komen decision, they have decided again to pick on women's health.

Just last week, the junior Senator from Missouri introduced an amendment to a job-creating transportation infrastructure bill that is as extreme as anything we have seen. It is an amendment that will allow any employer--a barber, a banker, a multinational corporation--to be given an exemption to not cover contraception or any essential preventive for any religious or moral reason. It is an amendment that would give any employer an unprecedented license to dictate what women can and

cannot have covered. It puts your employer smack in the middle between you and your health care. It is politics between women and their health care, and before the news that women across the country awoke to this morning, it was just the most recent in a very long line of attacks on our reproductive rights.

Contraceptive coverage should not be a controversial issue. It is supported by the vast majority of Americans who understand how important it is for women and their families, but let me remind everyone Republicans have made it clear from the start this is not about what is best for women or men or their family-planning decisions, it is apparently a political calculation. This is about their constituency. It is about their continued push to do whatever it takes to push their extreme agenda.

The women of the Senate, the Democratic women, are here to say enough. We are standing today and every day to fight for women and their right to make their own basic health care decisions, not their employer, not an extreme part of the Republican Party, not some men on a panel but themselves. We will continue to do so, and I am proud to stand with the women of the Senate to do just that.

I yield the floor.

Senator Kirsten Gillibrand
SENATOR Kirsten Gillibrand

OF NEW YORK

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may consume 3 minutes and my colleague from California may also consume 3 minutes before we move on to the next matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I have said it time and time again all across New York State at event after event: We need more women's voices in our decisionmaking process. We need more women at the table in government and in business. When women are at the table, they bring a very different perspective to the same problems, a different set of solutions, a different approach. At the end of the day, the outcomes are better when women's voices are heard.

But just when I thought I couldn't be any more dumbfounded by the debate around

here in terms of denying access to women's health services, there was a hearing yesterday in the House of Representatives on the topic of contraception and all the witnesses were male. My colleague, Carolyn Maloney, had it quite right when she walked out on that farce.

Let me be clear, once again: 99 percent of all America's women have used contraception at some time in their lifetime. When will they get this simple, nondebatable fact that the power to decide whether a woman will use contraception lies with her, not her boss, not her employer. What is more intrusive than trying to allow an employer to make medical decisions for someone who works for them? This has nothing to do with religious freedom, and you don't have to take it from me. Take it from Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia. In the majority decision of the 1990 case on Employment Division v. Smith, Scalia wrote:

"We have never held that an individual's religious beliefs excuse him from compliance with an otherwise valid law prohibiting conduct that the State is free to regulate."

It is time to end this ridiculous, ideological fight once and for all and get back to the real business at hand of growing our economy and getting Americans back to work.

But if our Republican colleagues want to continue to take this issue head on, we will stand here as often as is necessary and draw a line in the sand that the women of the Senate will continue to oppose these attacks on women's rights and women's health care.

I yield the floor for my colleague from California.

Senator Barbara Boxer
SENATOR Barbara Boxer

OF CALIFORNIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my fellow colleagues this morning. They are eloquent. When I looked at this scene

that Senator Murray and Senator Shaheen had up here and looked at this picture of this panel that is supposed to be speaking about women's health--in particular, birth control--obviously I was stunned. It brought back a memory from 20 years ago when all of America looked at the Senate and saw there was not one woman on the Senate Judiciary Committee, and they realized that year, in 1991, that there were only two women in the entire Senate. It sent shockwaves through the country. Whether one agreed with Anita Hill or Clarence Thomas, that was not the point. We had very strong feelings about that on both sides.

The point of this is that on an issue so critical to this Nation, the next Supreme Court Justice, there was not one woman on the Senate Judiciary Committee, and we had the ``Year of the Woman, and we tripled the number of women in the Senate. It wasn't much, 2 to 6, but it was a start, and now we are at 17, and we are going higher because yesterday this is what America saw, a Republican House of Representatives that is so hostile to women's health that they didn't even think about having a person on there who was a female, nor did they have anyone on there that agreed it is important that women have access to birth control knowing that for many women birth control is medicine, knowing that 99 percent of women, sometime in her lifetime, utilized birth control.

So this picture is worth a thousand words. I have a 16-year-old grandson. I came home, I had this picture in my hand. I went up to him--he's not particularly political--and I said: Zach, what do you notice about this? He said: ``It's all dudes. This does not take a degree in political science to see what is going on here. When we come back, we are going to be on the highway bill. There will be some bumps in the road along the way, but at one point we will probably have an amendment to vote on called the Blunt amendment. As we get to that later, I will talk about it.

But Senator Blunt, a Republican Senator from Missouri, has put forward an amendment that would allow any single employer--regardless of how large or small their operation--to deny essential health care to their employees and preventive health care if they simply say it is a matter of conscience. It is right there. Senator Blunt says: Oh, no. I heard Senator Brown defending Senator Blunt saying: No, no. Oh, yes. Just read it and look at the list of lifesaving and health-saving services that would be denied.

So women of America and the men who care about you, get ready because there is an assault on women, and stand with us.

Thank you very much.

I would yield the floor.

This work is in the public domain in the United States because it is a work of the United States federal government (see 17 U.S.C. 105).

Cover art sources:

Description
English: Senator Margaret Chase Smith
Date before 1973
Source http://history.house.gov/People/Detail/21866?ret=True
Author U.S. Senate Historical Office
Licensing
Public domain This United States Congress image is in the public domain. This may be because it was taken by an employee of the Congress as part of that person's official duties, or because it has been released into the public domain and posted on the official websites of a member of Congress. As a work of the U.S. federal government, the image is in the public domain.

Description
Official portrait of U.S. Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA)
Date 28 April 2016
Source http://www.warren.senate.gov/?p=biography
Author United States Senate
This United States Congress image is in the public domain. This may be because it was taken by an employee of the Congress as part of that person's official duties, or because it has been released into the public domain and posted on the official websites of a member of Congress. As a work of the U.S. federal government, the image is in the public domain.

Movers and Shakers is a Creative Commons Non-Commercial copyright project by Matt Pierard, 2020.